

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

SALVADOR SANCHEZ,

Plaintiff,
v.

Case No. 15-cv-935-pp

**TODD OLIG, PAUL LUDVIGSON,
and JEREMY WESTRA**

Defendants.

**DECISION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION (DKT. NO. 41)**

On May 5, 2016, the court granted the defendants' motion to stay the proceedings in this case until March 1, 2017, because defendant Todd Olig had been mobilized to active duty in the Army National Guard. Dkt. No. 37. On July 18, 2016, the plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction. Dkt No. 41. He alleges that staff members at Wisconsin Resource Center have threatened him and other inmates with the denial of psychiatric treatment and/or transfer from the facility for accessing the courts. Id. at 1-2. The plaintiff also challenges a Wisconsin Resource Center policy that permits inmates to assist one another with legal matters only with the permission of the institution unit supervisor. Id. at 2.

To obtain preliminary injunctive relief . . . [a] plaintiff must show that (1) his underlying case has some likelihood of success on the merits, (2) no adequate remedy at law exists, and (3) he will suffer irreparable harm without the injunction. Hashim v. Hamblin, Case No. 14-cv-1265-LA, 2015 WL

1840434, at *3 (E.D. Wis. April 22, 2016). The “underlying case” in this lawsuit concerns events that occurred at Waupun Correctional Institution. The injunctive relief that the plaintiff seeks is not related to the “underlying case” of the events that occurred at Waupun. Thus, the court cannot, in this case, grant the plaintiff the injunctive relief he seeks. See Hashim v. Hamblin, Case No. 14-cv-1265, 2016 WL 297465 at *4 (E.D. Wis. January 22, 2016) (“Plaintiff’s requests for injunctive relief are not connected to the claims he is proceeding on in this case. He may not seek relief in connection with these claims in this lawsuit.”) (citations omitted). If the plaintiff believes that he has claims against employees at the Wisconsin Secure Resource Center, he may file a separate lawsuit against those individuals. See Hashim, 2015 WL 1840434 at *3 (quoting George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007) (“Unrelated claims against different defendants belong in different suits.”))

The court also reminds the plaintiff that the court has stayed all proceedings in this case until March 1, 2017. This means that the plaintiff should not file any further documents in this case until the court lifts the stay.

The court **DENIES** the plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction. Dkt. No. 41.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 29th day of July, 2016.

BY THE COURT:



HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge